REMARKS-General

1. The newly drafted independent claim 21 incorporates all structural limitations of the original claim 15 and includes further limitations previously brought forth in the disclosure. No new matter has been included. All claims 21-26 are submitted to be of sufficient clarity and detail to enable a person of average skill in the art to make and use the instant invention, so as to be pursuant to 35 USC 112.

2. With regard to the rejection of record based on prior art, Applicant will advance arguments to illustrate the manner in which the invention defined by the newly introduced claims is patentably distinguishable from the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

Response to Rejection of Claims 15-20 under 35USC103

3. The Examiner rejects claims 15-17 as being unpatentable over Mori et al. (US 6,456,003) in view of Anthony (US 6,437,040), Arora et al. (US 2002/0045007) and O'Connor et al. (US 2002/0172827), rejects claims 15-16 and 18-19 as being unpatentable over Mori et al in view of Anthony, Arora et al and Schultz et al, and rejects claims 15-16 and 20 as being upatentable over Mori et al in view of Anthony, Arora et al and Dattagupta et al.

4. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 103:

"(a) A patent may not be obtained thought the invention is **not identically** disclosed or described as set forth in **section 102 of this title**, if the **differences** between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the **subject matter as a whole would have been obvious** at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made."

5. In view of 35 U.S.C. 103(a), it is apparent that to be qualified as a prior art under 35USC103(a), the prior art must be cited under 35USC102(a)~(g) but the disclosure of the prior art and the invention are not identical and there are one or more

differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art. In addition, such differences between the subject matter sought to be patented **as a whole** and the prior art are obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

6. In other words, the differences between the subject matter sought to be patent as a whole of the instant invention and Mori et al which is qualified as prior art of the instant invention under 35USC102(b) are obvious in view of Anthony, Arora et al, O'Connor et al, Schultz et al, and Dattagupta et al at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains.

7 The applicant respectfully submits that the differences between the instant invention and Mori et al are not obvious in view of either or in combination of Anthony, Arora et al, O'Connor et al, Schultz et al, and Dattagupta et al under 35USC103(a), due to the following reasons.

8. Mori et al. teaches that an organic buffer layer can be used between the electrode and the organic layer to improve the adhesion therebetween. However, Mori et al. also discloses that the organic buffer layer must contain sulfur atoms (Mori et al., Col. 4, Line 64 and Abstract) as a bonder contacting the electrode and the organic buffer layer. The applicant respectfully submits that there is no sulfur atom in the organic buffer layer formed by the method of the instant invention. In the instant invention, the bonder is fatty acid salt having a chemical structure containing five to twenty carbon atoms (C.sub.5 to C.sub.20).

9. Mori et al. discloses that the organic buffer layers, being composed of sulfur atoms, is inherently conductive. However, the organic buffer layer of the instant invention is insulating.

10. It is important to mention that the long elastic hydrocarbon chain disclosed in the instant invention would act as a spring which minimizes any damage induced by different expansion coefficients between the organic buffer layer and metal. Mori et al. fails to anticipate this feature.

11. The applicant respectfully submits that this is clearly **not** a proper basis for combining references in making out an obviousness rejection of the present claims. Rather, the invention must be considered ***as a whole*** and ***there must be something in the reference that suggests the combination or the modification***. See Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick, 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 488 (Fed. Cir. 1984) ("The claimed invention must be considered as a whole, and the question is whether there is something in the prior art as a whole to suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination"), In re Gordon, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984), ("The mere fact that the prior art could be so modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.") In re Laskowski, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1397, 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1989), ("Although the Commissioner suggests that [the structure in the primary prior art reference] could readily be modified to form the [claimed] structure, "[t]he mere fact that the prior art could be modified would not have made the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification.")

12. In the present case, there is no such suggestion. According to the newly drafted claims 21-26 of the instant invention, a method of producing an **organic light-emitting device** is claimed, wherein the organic light-emitting device having a hole transporting layer, an organic transporting layer overlapped on the hole transporting layer, an electron transporting layer overlapped on the organic transporting layer and an insulating organic buffer layer sandwiched between the electron transporting layer and a metallic cathode layer.

13. The applicant respectfully submits that "The mere fact that a reference could be modified to produce the patented invention would not make the modification obvious unless it is suggested by the prior art." Libbey-Owens-Ford v. BOC Group, 4 USPQ 2d 1097, 1103 (DCNJ 1987).

Although Mori et al merely suggests an organic electroluminescent devices and panel, Anthony et al merely teaches a water-soluble block copolymers comprising a hydrophilic block and a hydrophobic block, Arora et al teaches a composition with film forming alkylsilsesquioxane polymer and method for apply hydrophobic films to surfaces, O'Connor et al teaches nano-size dispersible powders and method of making, Schultz et

al suggests shaped soap product comprising talc, one or more fatty acids in the form of their alkali soaps and one or more cationic surfactants with the simultaneous absence of alkyl (oligo) glycosides, and Dattagupta et al suggests a method for the intracellular delivery of biomolecules.

14. None of the cited arts, Anthony et al, Arora et al, O'Connor et al, Schultz et al, and Dattagupta et al, did suggest the incorporation of the disclosure thereof to an organic light-emitting device. Applicant believes that neither Mori et al, Anthony et al, Arora et al, O'Connor et al, Schultz et al, nor Dattagupta et al separately or in combination, suggest or make any mention whatsoever of producing an organic light-emitting device having layers of anode glass base, hole transporting layer, organic light emitting layer, electron transporting layer, metallic cathode layer, and insulating organic buffer layer which is sandwiched between the electronic transporting layer and the metallic cathode layer while the insulating organic buffer layer having a lipophilic tail group and a hydrophilic head group boned to the electron transporting layer and the metallic cathode layer respectfully in such a manner that said insulating organic buffer layer forms a heat insulating media between the electron transporting layer and the metallic cathode layer for preventing an uneven thermal expansion difference therebetween during operating the organic light-emitting device, the insulating organic buffer layer of the instant invention is produced by providing a fatty acid salt having a chemical structure containing five to twenty carbon atoms (C.sub.5 to C.sub.20), wherein a head group of said fatty acid salt is formed as the hydrophilic head group and the tail group of the fatty acid salt is formed as the lipophilic tail group, and growing the fatty acid salt through a thermal deposition system having a vacuum degree above 1.0*10.sup.-3 Pascal, and a temperature between 300°C to 400°C, to control a growing speed of the fatty acid from 0.1 to 0.9 nanometer per minute so as to produce the insulating organic buffer layer, as claimed in the newly drafted claim 21.

15. In view of the above, it is submitted that the newly drafted claims 21-26 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested. Allowance of claims 21-26 at an early date is solicited.

16. Should the examiner believe that anything further is needed in order to place the application in condition for allowance, he is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Raymond Y. Chan
Reg. Nr.: 37,484
108 N. Ynez Ave.
Suite 128
Monterey Park, CA 91754
Tel.: 1-626-571-9812
Fax.: 1-626-571-9813

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this corresponding is being deposited with the United States Postal Service by First Class Mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to "Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on the date below.

Date: 02/05/2008

Signature:
Person Signing: Raymond Y. Chan